UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/992,567	11/14/2001	James H. Boyden	4000.2.92	5255

32641 7590 06/13/2005

DIGEO, INC C/O STOEL RIVES LLP
201 SOUTH MAIN STREET, SUITE 1100
ONE UTAH CENTER
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111

EXAMINER	
RAMAKRISHNAIAH, MELUR	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2643	

DATE MAILED: 06/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/992,567	BOYDEN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Melur Ramakrishnaiah	2643	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *17 January 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,3-5,9-26,28-30 and 34-37* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1, 3-5, 9-26, 28-30, 34-37* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *12-13-02,*
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1, 19-20, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kakii (US PAT: 5,815,197) in view of Takeo et al. (JP 07-131697, hereinafter Takeo).

Regarding claim 1, Kakii discloses an apparatus for obtaining a video signal from a position proximate an eye level of a person viewing display, the apparatus comprising: a flexible coupling (reads on 101, fig. 3) having a camera portion removably secured to display (8, figs. 2-4) to position the camera portion alongside a screen portion of the display, a camera (5, figs. 2, 4) and a camera attachment to attach camera to the camera portion as shown in figs. 3-4 such that the camera is positioned between the screen portion and the person (col. 13, line 45 – col. 15, line 37).

Regarding claim 19, Kakii discloses an apparatus for obtaining a video signal from a position proximate an eye level of a person viewing a display, the apparatus comprising: a base (6, fig. 2, 61, fig. 4) resting on the display over a screen portion of the display (8, figs. 2, 4), a flexible line (10, fig. 2, 110, fig. 4) suspended from the base, the flexible line having a camera position disposed along side the screen (8, figs. 2, 4) and a fixation portion attached to the base (figs. 2, 4), and a camera attached to the

camera portion such that camera is suspended from the flexible line and positioned between the screen portion and the person (col. 13, line 45 – col. 15, line 37).

Kakii differs from claims 1 and 19 in that although he teaches different ideas of camera attachment to attach camera to the camera portion such that camera is camera is positioned between screen portion and a person as shown in figs. 2-7; he does not explicitly teach the following: a loop of flexible material having a length sufficient to encircle the display, and flexible material to support camera.

However, Takeo discloses a holder bond which teaches the following: a loop of flexible material having a length sufficient to encircle user's head and flexible material to support camera(figs. 1-5, see abstract and paragraphs: 5-20).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art the time invention was made to modify Kakii's system to provide for the following: flexible coupling comprises a flexible loop having a length to encircle the display, and flexible material to support camera as this arrangement would provide one of the methods for positioning the camera between the display screen and the user among many methods available for positing the camera as demonstrated by Kakii

Regarding claim 20, Kakii further teaches the following: the base (6, figs. 2, 4) rests on top side of the display in an unsecured manner (figs. 2, 4, col. 13, line 45 – col. 15, line 37).

2. Claims 3-5, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kakii in view of Takeo as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Boyer et al. (US PAT: 5,713,548, hereinafter Boyer).

Regarding claims 3-5, the combination does not teach the following: flexible loop exerts inward pressure against the display such that fixation portion frictionally engages the display, flexible loop is elastic, the flexible loop having an unstretched configuration in which length is insufficient to encircle the display, and a stretched configuration in which length is sufficient to encircle the display, an adjustment mechanism that selectively tightens the flexible loop around the display.

However, Boyer discloses system for enclosing a computer or other article on the human body which teaches the following: flexible loop exerts inward pressure against the body such that fixation portion frictionally engages the body, flexible loop is elastic, the flexible loop having an unstretched configuration in which length is insufficient to encircle the body, and a stretched configuration in which length is sufficient to encircle the body, an adjustment mechanism that selectively tightens the flexible loop around the body (col. 3 lines 34-59).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art the time invention was made to modify the combination to provide for the following: flexible loop exerts inward pressure against the display such that fixation portion frictionally engages the display, flexible loop is elastic, the flexible loop having an unstretched configuration in which length is insufficient to encircle the display, and a stretched configuration in which length is sufficient to encircle the display, an adjustment mechanism that

selectively tightens the flexible loop around the display as this arrangement would provide one of the methods for positioning the camera between the display screen and the user among many methods available for positing the camera as demonstrated by Kakii

3. Claims 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kakii in view of Takeo as applied to claim 19 above, and further in view of Ganthier et al (US PAT: 6,081, 422, hereinafter Ganthier).

Regarding claims 21-22, the combination does not teach the following: display attachment that attaches the base to the top side of the display, attachment comprises a hook and loop fastening system with a first portion affixed to the top side and a second portion affixed to the base. However, Ganthier discloses universal mount for computer peripheral device which teaches the following: display attachment that attaches the base to the top side of the display, attachment comprises a hook and loop fastening system with a first portion affixed to the top side and a second portion affixed to the base (fig. 9 col. 6 lines 22-39).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art the time invention was made to modify the combination to provide for the following: display attachment that attaches the base to the top side of the display, attachment comprises a hook and loop fastening system with a first portion affixed to the top side and a second portion affixed to the base as this arrangement would provide another means for securing the base for camera on a display as taught by Ganthier, thus contributing to variety of choices for the user to attach the camera equipment to display.

4. Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kakii in view of Takeo , Boyer as applied to claim 21 above, and further in view of Marks, Jr. (US PAT: 4,863,130, hereinafter Marks).

Regarding claim 23, the combination does not teach the following: display attachment comprises a suction cup disposed on the underside of the base to selectively engage the topside.

However, Marks discloses adjustable device for mounting an electronic imaging camera to a surface by a vacuum which teaches the following: display attachment comprises a suction cup disposed on the underside of the base to selectively engage the topside (col. 3, line 28 – col. 4, line 60).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art the time invention was made to modify the combination to provide for the following: display attachment comprises a suction cup disposed on the underside of the base to selectively engage the topside as this arrangement would provide another method of attaching base of the device to the surface to support as taught by Marks, thus contributing to variety of choices for the user to attach the camera equipment to display.

5. Claims 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kakii in view of Takeo as applied to claim 19 above, and further in view of Tsai (US PAT: 5,519,597).

Regarding claims 24-25, the combination does not teach the following: base comprises a retractor that selectively exerts tension on the fixation portion to retract the

camers into a retracted position in which the camera is not disposed along side the screen portion, retraction comprises a pulley around which the fixation portion is disposed, wherein the pulley is rotatable to draw the camera into the retracted position.

However, Tsai discloses elevation mechanism for lamp device which teaches the following: base comprises a retractor that selectively exerts tension on the fixation portion to retract the lamp device into a retracted position in which the device is not disposed along side of the working area, retraction comprises a pulley around which the fixation portion is disposed, wherein the pulley is rotatable to draw the lamp device into the retracted position.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art the time invention was made to modify the combination to provide for the following: base comprises a retractor that selectively exerts tension on the fixation portion to retract the camers into a retracted position in which the camera is not disposed along side the screen portion, retraction comprises a pulley around which the fixation portion is disposed, wherein the pulley is rotatable to draw the camera into the retracted position as this arrangement would provide means to retract the device so that it does not cause interference with other activities, thus giving the user means to move the things away from user activities.

2. Claims 9-11, 13, 16-17, 26, 34, 35-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takashi (JP 2000-214517) in view of Takeo.

Regarding claim 9, Takashi discloses an apparatus for obtaining a video signal from a position proximate an eye level of a person viewing the display, the apparatus

comprising: a camera (50, Drawings: 4-7), and a camera attachment (52A, Drawings: 4-7) that attaches the camera to the camera portion such that the camera is positioned between the screen portion and the persons (Drawing 5, paragraphs: 0063-0070).

Takashi differs from claim 9 in that although he teaches different ideas of camera attachment to attach camera to the camera portion such that camera is positioned between the screen portion and the person (Paragraphs: 0067-0068), he does not explicitly teach the following: flexible coupling comprises a flexible loop having a length to encircle the display.

However, Takeo discloses a holder bond which teaches the following: flexible coupling comprises a flexible loop having a length to encircle the user head (figs. 1-5, see abstract, paragraphs: 5-20).

However, Takeo discloses a holder bond which teaches the following: flexible coupling comprises a flexible loop having a length to encircle the user head (figs. 1-5, see abstract, paragraphs: 5-20).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art the time invention was made to modify Takashi's system to provide for the following: flexible coupling comprises a flexible loop having a length to encircle the display as this arrangement would provide one of the methods for positioning the camera between the display screen and the user among many methods available for positing the camera as demonstrated by Takashi.

Regarding claims 10-11, Takashi does not teach the following: flexible loop comprises an elastic band sized to grip the display such that the fixation portion abuts

back side of the display, a strap, and an adjustment mechanism that engages the strap around the display.

However, Takeo teaches the following: flexible loop comprises an elastic band sized to grip the body (fig. 5) such that the fixation portion abuts back side of the body, a strap, and an adjustment mechanism that engages the strap around the body (paragraphs: 0005-0020).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art the time invention was made to modify Takashi's system to provide for the following: flexible loop comprises an elastic band sized to grip the display such that the fixation portion abuts back side of the display, a strap, and an adjustment mechanism that engages the strap around the display as this arrangement would provide one of the methods for positioning the camera between the display screen and the user among many methods available for positing the camera as demonstrated by Takashi.

Regarding claims 13, 16,17, Takashi teaches the following: camera attachment permits rapid, manual removal of the camera from the camera position (Drawing 6), camera attachment comprises an adhesive disposed between a back side of camera and camera portion to permanently affix the camera to the camera portion (paragraph: 0070), display attachment that attaches the fixation portion to the display (Drawing 4).

Regarding claim 26, Takashi discloses a method for obtaining a video signal from a position proximate an eye level of a person viewing display, the apparatus, comprising: providing a flexible coupling (52C, Drawing 6) having a camera portion 50 (Drawings: 4-7) and a fixation portion, providing camera, attaching the camera to the

camera portion with camera attachment (52A, Drawings: 4-7), and securing the fixation portion to the display such that camera portion is suspended along side a screen portion of the display (Drawings: 4-5), between the screen portion and the person (Drawings: 4-5, paragraphs: 0063 –0070).

Regarding claim 34, Takashi discloses an apparatus for obtaining a video signal from a position proximate an eye level of a person viewing a display, the apparatus comprising: a flexible coupling means (52C, Drawing 6) having a camera portion (50, Drawings: 4-7) and a fixation portion removably secured to the display to position the camera portion along side a screen portion of the display (16, Drawings 4-5), a camera (50, Drawings: 4-7), and an attachment means (52A, Drawings: 4-7) to attach the camera portion such that the camera is positioned between the screen portion and the person (Drawing: 5, paragraphs: 0063 –0070).

Regarding claim 35, Takashi discloses a method for obtaining a video signal from a position proximate an eye level of a person viewing a display, the apparatus comprising: providing a flexible coupling (52C, drawing 6), providing a camera (50, Drawings 4-7), attaching the camera to the camera to a camera to camera portion with a camera attachment (52A, Drawings 4-7), and securing the fixation portion to the display by disposing the fixation portion proximate to the a topside of the display (Drawing 6) such that flexible line hangs downward along the screen portion such that camera is suspended along side the screen portion of the display, between the screen portion and a person (Drawings 4-5, paragraphs: 0063-0070)

Takashi differs from claims 26, 34 and 35 in that although Takashi teaches an attaching the camera such that camera is positioned between the screen portion and the person (Drawing 5); he does not teach explicitly teach the following: flexible loop having a length sufficient to encircle the display to attach the camera to display, a flexible line having a flexible material to attach camera.

However, Takeo discloses a holder bond which teaches the following: a loop of flexible material having a length sufficient to encircle user's head and flexible line having a flexible material to attach camera (figs. 1-5, see abstract and paragraphs: 5-20).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art the time invention was made to modify Kakii's system to provide for the following: flexible loop having a length sufficient to encircle the display to attach the camera to display, a flexible line having a flexible material to attach camera as this arrangement would provide one of the methods for positioning the camera between the display screen and the user, among many methods available, for positing the camera as demonstrated by Takashi.

Regarding claim 36-37, Takashi teaches the following: providing a base, and disposing the base to rest on the top side to grip the fixation portion (Drawings 5-6, 8), a basebase retractably grips the fixation portion such that the base is capable of retracting the camera into a retracted position in which camera is not disposed alongside the screen portion (Drawing 6, paragraphs: 0063-0070).

6. Claims 28-30, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takashi in view of Takeo as applied to claim 26 above, and further in view of Boyer et al. (US PAT: 5,713,548, hereinafter Boyer).

Regarding claims 28-30, the combination does not teach the following: flexible loop exerts inward pressure against the display such that fixation portion frictionally engages the display, flexible loop is elastic, the flexible loop having an unstretched configuration in which length is insufficient to encircle the display, and a stretched configuration in which length is sufficient to encircle the display, an adjustment mechanism that selectively tightens the flexible loop around the display.

However, Boyer discloses system for enclosing a computer or other article on the human body which teaches the following: flexible loop exerts inward pressure against the body such that fixation portion frictionally engages the body, flexible loop is elastic, the flexible loop having an unstretched configuration in which length is insufficient to encircle the body, and a stretched configuration in which length is sufficient to encircle the body, an adjustment mechanism that selectively tightens the flexible loop around the body (col. 3 lines 34-59).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art the time invention was made to modify the combination to provide for the following: flexible loop exerts inward pressure against the display such that fixation portion frictionally engages the display, flexible loop is elastic, the flexible loop having an unstretched configuration in which length is insufficient to encircle the display, and a stretched configuration in which length is sufficient to encircle the display, an adjustment mechanism that

selectively tightens the flexible loop around the display as this arrangement would provide one of the methods for positioning the camera between the display screen and the user among many methods available for positing the camera as demonstrated by Takeo.

7. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takashi in view of Takeo as applied to claim 9 above, and further in view of Kakii.

The combination differs from claim 12 in that it teaches flexible loop (See Takeo Drawings: 1, 5), it does not teach it is transparent.

However, Kakii teaches the following: the camera support mechanism of the image pickup apparatus is preferably formed of an inexpensive transparent material (col. 14 lines 40-46).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art the time invention was made to modify the combination to provide for the following: portion of the flexible loop is transparent as this arrangement would prevent the camera support system obstructing the view of the image displayed on the monitor as taught by Kakii, thus facilitating the user to see the image displayed clearly.

8. Claims 14 and 18, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takashi in view of Takeo as applied to claim 9 above, and further in view of Boyer.

Regarding claims 14 and 18, the combination does not teach the following: camera attachment comprises a hook and loop fastening system with a first portion affixed to a back side of the camera and a second portion affixed to a the camera

portion, display attachment comprises a hook and loop fastening system with a first portion attached to the display and a second portion attached to a fixation portion.

However, Boyer teaches the following: device detachment comprises a hook and loop fastening system with a first portion affixed to a back side of the device and a second portion affixed to a the device portion, device attachment comprises a hook and loop fastening system with a first portion attached to the device and a second portion attached to a fixation portion (col. 3 lines 34-59).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art the time invention was made to modify the combination to provide for the following: camera attachment comprises a hook and loop fastening system with a first portion affixed to a back side of the camera and a second portion affixed to a the camera portion, display attachment comprises a hook and loop fastening system with a first portion attached to the display and a second portion attached to a fixation portion as this arrangement would provide one of the methods for positioning the camera between the display screen and the user among many methods available for positing the camera as demonstrated by Takashi.

9. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takashi in view of Takeo as applied to claim 9 above, and further in view of Krekelberg (US PAT: 5,855,343).

Regarding claim 15, the combination does not teach the following: camera attachment comprises a clip disposed on the back side of the camera to selectively engage the camera portion.

However, Krekelberg discloses camera clip which teaches the following: camera attachment comprises a clip disposed on the back side of the camera to selectively engage the camera portion (col. 4, line 5 – col. 5, line 54).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art the time invention was made to modify the combination to provide for the following: camera attachment comprises a clip disposed on the back side of the camera to selectively engage the camera portion as this arrangement would provide another method to attach the camera to the support system as taught by Krekelberg, thus providing choices for the user.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed on 1-17-2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Rejection of amended claim 1 under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kakii in view of Takeo et al. (JP 07-131697, hereinafter Takeo): Applicant argues that claim 1 is further patentable over the combination of Kakii and Takeo because nonanalogous art cannot form the basis of a rejection and applicant further goes into quoting case laws to promote his argument. Examiner does not agree with applicant's contention that Takeo is nonanalogous art because, although Takeo does not discloses camera is used in context of video conferencing, he teaches camera attachment (drawings: 1, 5) by flexible material to attach camera around user's head and camera is used for taking pictures by the user (paragraphs: 0016-0021). Takeo reference

further teaches attaching the camera by flexible material to various structures such as tree, pillar, in addition to the body (paragraph 22) and Kakii teaches various ways of camera attachment such that camera is positioned between screen portion and the person as shown in fig. 2-7, but Kakii does not teach flexible loop to attach camera around display. But Takeo teaches using flexible loop attach the camera to user head and also he teaches his arrangement can be used to attach to other structures. In view of this Kakii combined with Takeo teaches the claim limitation of claim 1 and therefore rejection of claim 1 is maintained.

Regarding rejection claim 1, Apllicant further argues that Kakii and Takeo do not provide motivation to combine the references ... Even if all the elements of claim are disclosed in the various prior art references, the claimed invention taken as a whole cannot be said to be obvious without some reason given in the prior art why one of ordinary skill would have been prompted to combine the teachings of the references to arrive at the claimed invention". In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988)and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Kakii teaches various ways of camera attachment such that camera is positioned between screen portion and the person as shown in fig. 2-7, but Kakii does not teach

flexible loop to attach camera around display. But Takeo teaches using flexible loop to attach the camera to user head and also he teaches his arrangement can be used to attach to other structures (paragraph: 0022). Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made would be motivated to combine Takeo teaching in Kakii reference as this arrangement would provide one of the methods of attaching camera to a given object to satisfy a user requirements for a given application.

Applicant further argues that "Takeo discloses head mounted camera to film user's perspective. The captured film is reviewed ... Takeo teaches away from from kakii and the present invention. There is no impetus to combine videoconference camera mount of Kaii with a head mounted camera of Takeo. Accordingly Takeo is not properly combined with Kakii and does not present a bar to patentability of the present invention". In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Regarding amended claim 19 and its rejection under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being obvious over Kakii in view of Takeo, Takeo teaches flexible material to support the camera and Kakii in combination with Takeo teaches applicant's limitations of claim 19.

Regarding rejection of claim 9 under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being over Takashi (JP2000-214517) in view of Takeo, Applicant makes similar arguments as made in

connection with rejection of claim 1, explanation provided in connection with rejection of claim 1 holds good.

Regarding rejection of claim 26 and 34, Applicant arguments are moot as rejection of claims 26 and 24 is now based on 35 U.S.C 103(a).

In light of this, rejection of claims 1, 3-5, 8-26, 28-30, 34 is maintained and rejection of new claims is set forth above in the office action.

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Melur Ramakrishnaiah whose telephone number is (703) 305-1461. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:30-4:00; every other F Off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Curtis Kuntz can be reached on (703)305-4708. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Melur Ramakrishnaiah
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2643